

REMARKS

1. In response to the final Office Action mailed October 25, 2005, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. Claims 1-17, 21 and 22 were last presented for examination. In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-17, 21 and 22 were rejected. By the foregoing Amendments, claims 1, 17 and 22 have been amended, claim 21 has been canceled and claims 23-43 have been added. Thus, upon entry of this paper, claims 1-17 and 22-43 will be pending in this application. Of these thirty-nine (39) claims, three (3) claims (claim 1, 17 and 23) are independent. Based on the above Amendments and following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that all outstanding objections and rejections be reconsidered, and that they be withdrawn.

Examiner Interview

2. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the time spent in a telephonic interview attended by the undersigned representative and the Examiner on November 9, 2005. In the interview agreement was reached regarding amendments which will place this application in condition for allowance. The agreements are noted in the following Remarks.

Art of Record

3. Applicant acknowledges receipt of form PTO/SB/08A filed by Applicant on June 28, 2005, which has been initialed by the Examiner indicating consideration of the references cited therein.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 2-16, 21 and 22 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base and intervening claims.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

5. Independent claim 17 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. In the noted interview the Examiner agreed that the above Amendments to the preamble of claim 17 accommodate the Examiner's rejection. Specifically, the preamble of claim 17 has been amended to recite “[a] computer-implemented method for providing access to management information related to managed entities in a computing environment, comprising;” in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

6. Independent claims 1 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,889,990 to Coleman, *et al.* (hereinafter, “Coleman”). Based upon the above Amendments and following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

7. Applicant has incorporated the recitations of claim 21 into claims 1 and 17 to place the claims in condition for allowance. Claim 21 was objected to in the Office Action, and depended directly from claim 1. Thus, incorporation of claim 21 into claim 1 places claim 1 in allowable form.

8. Dependent claims 2-16 and 22 incorporate all of the subject matter of independent claim 1 and add additional subject matter which makes them independently patentable over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the outstanding rejections of the dependent claims be reconsidered and withdrawn.

9. With regard to claim 17, the Examiner agreed that amending claim 17 to similarly include the recitations of claim 21 (converted from an apparatus to method limitation) would also place claim 17 in allowable form. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 102 rejection of claim 1 and 17 bee reconsidered and withdrawn.

New claims

10. Applicant has added new claims 23-43 by the foregoing Amendment. New independent claim 23 includes the recitations of previously pending claims 1 and 2. Independent claim 1 was rejected and dependent claim 2 was objected to in the outstanding Office Action. Claim 2 depended directly from claim 1; that is, there are no intervening claims. Accordingly, new claim 23 is allowable because it contains the recitations of an object claim (claim 2), its base claim (claim 1) and all intervening claims (none). In the above-noted Interview the Examiner agreed that such a claim would be allowed in the present application.

11. Applicant also added dependent claims 24-35 which depend directly or indirectly from new independent claim 23. These claims, which are similar to certain ones of objected claims 2-13, are allowable for depending from an allowable independent claim. In the above-noted Interview the Examiner agreed that such claims would be allowed in the present application.

12. Applicant also added dependent claims 36-43 which depend directly or indirectly from claim 17 which, as noted, is in condition for allowance. These claims, which are similar to certain ones of objected claims 2-13, are allowable for depending from an allowable independent claim. In the above-noted Interview the Examiner agreed that such claims would be allowed in the present application.

Conclusion

13. In view of the foregoing, this application should be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael G. Verga
Reg. No. 39,410

November 16, 2005